

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, and stand rejected.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Georgiou et al. ("Georgiou") (US 5,940,785) in view of McDermott et al. (US 6,192,479). The Applicant respectfully traverses. Even in combination, Georgiou and McDermott do not suggest the features of the claimed invention. Independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 18 as amended each calls for, among other things, a performance demanding level input to determine a rate of *temperature-related* frequency reduction.

The Examiner recognizes that Georgiou does not suggest a performance demanding level input to determine a rate of frequency reduction, and cites McDermott as disclosing this subject matter. However, McDermott only shows a form of PLL, in other words, a synchronization circuit. This synchronization circuit is in no way responsive to temperature. See, e.g., col. 5, lines 21-24 of McDermott: "... LVL2, LVL1 control the rate of change of the frequency according to the degree to which the input and reference clock signals are synchronized with one another." Accordingly, there would be no motivation for persons skilled in the art to look to McDermott to address temperature-related issues in circuit design, since McDermott only shows a circuit responsive to differences in phase, like any typical PLL.

Each of claims 2-3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13-17 depends on one of claims 1, 7 and 12, and consequently each is likewise allowable over Georgiou and McDermott for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-17 as being unpatentable over Georgiou in view of McDermott is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko (US 6,192,479) in view of Georgiou and McDermott. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 18 recites "performance demanding level logic to output a signal taking on values that respectively permit a first rate

of *temperature-related* frequency reduction and a second rate of *temperature-related* frequency reduction"; claims 19 and 20 include the latter features by dependence on claim 18. The Examiner recognizes that Ko is silent as to a rate of temperature change or a rate of frequency reduction. Accordingly, Ko is further unable to cure deficiencies in Georgiou and McDermott with respect to a rate of temperature-related frequency reduction, as discussed above. Therefore, even in combination, Ko, Georgiou and McDermott do not suggest the invention as set forth in claims 18-20. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-20 as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Georgiou and McDermott is therefore respectfully requested.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition, and earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4323 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 14, 2005

By: 
William E. Curry
Reg. No. 43,572

KENYON & KENYON
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax:(202) 220-4201